

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

REBECCA D. ABEL

PLAINTIFF

V.

NO. 4:15-CV-00017-DMB-JMV

**ALLSTATE PROPERTY AND CASUALTY
COMPANY, ET AL.**

DEFENDANTS

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On July 6, 2015, U.S. Magistrate Judge Jane M. Virden issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) recommending that Plaintiff’s case be dismissed because she “has neither served any of the defendants ... nor shown good cause for failure to do so.” Doc. #10. The R&R warned that “any ... objections [to the R&R] are required to be in writing and must be filed within fourteen days of this date. Failure to timely file written objections ... will bar an aggrieved party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal unobjected-to proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the district court.” *Id.* at 3. A copy of the R&R was mailed to the *pro se* plaintiff by United States Postal Service on July 6, 2015.

Fourteen days have elapsed since service of the R&R and no objection thereto has been filed or served by any party.¹ Accordingly, this Court’s review of the R&R is limited to plain error. *See Molina-Uribe v. U.S.*, No. B:97-97, 2009 WL 3535498, at *15 (S.D. Tex. Sep. 10, 2009) (“In the absence of plain error, a party’s failure to object timely to a Magistrate Judge’s

¹ The docket reflects two filings by Plaintiff after the Report and Recommendation. Docs. #11, #12. The first, filed on July 6, 2015, seeks, among other things, Judge Virden’s recusal and an admission of guilt from the defendants, and also includes several return receipts for mail sent to an attorney and various judicial officers. Doc. #11. Plaintiff’s second filing, made on July 9, 2015, contains Plaintiff’s “Amnesty Oath”, “Warrant Claim of Fact”, and interlineated copies of several of the Court’s earlier orders. Doc. #12. Neither of these filings objects to the Report and Recommendation nor addresses the deficiencies noted therein.

Report and Recommendation waives any right to further judicial review of that decision.”)
(citing *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428–29 (5th Cir. 1997)).

The Court has reviewed the R&R and has found no plain error. Accordingly, the R&R is
APPROVED and ADOPTED as the opinion of the Court. Thus, this case is hereby
DISMISSED with prejudice.

SO ORDERED, this 24th day of July, 2015.

/s/ Debra M. Brown
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE